

WITH A NEW INTRODUCTION BY ANDREA L. SMITH

MIRROR FOR MAN

THE RELATION OF ANTHROPOLOGY TO MODERN LIFE

CLYDE KLUCKHOHN



"If the statesmen of the world had the knowledge contained in this book, people everywhere could sleep sounder at night."

Stuart Chase

"Fascinating and enlightening."

The Saturday Review of Literature

"[A] miracle in the clear and simple presentation and interpretation of human institutions and behavior . . . delightful reading, instructive reading."

Chicago Tribune



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

MIRROR FOR MAN

While the world has undoubtedly been shrinking, at the same time it has grown more complex. The likelihood of culture clashes leading to outright conflict is high, perhaps higher than ever. As Andrea L. Smith convincingly argues in her new introduction to this classic work, certain questions are as valid today as in 1949, when *Mirror for Man* was first published. Can anthropology break down prejudices that exist between peoples and nations? Can knowledge of past human behavior help solve the world's modern problems? What effect will American attitudes likely have on the future of the world?

In *Mirror for Man*, Clyde Kluckhohn scrutinizes anthropology, showing how the discipline can contribute to the reconciliation of conflicting cultures. He questions age-old race theories, shows how people came to be as they are, and examines limitations in how human beings can be molded. Taking up one of the most vital questions in the post-World War II world, whether international order can be achieved by domination, Kluckhohn demonstrates that cultural clashes drive much of the world's conflict, and shows how we can help resolve it if only we are willing to work for joint understanding.

By interpreting human behavior, Kluckhohn reveals that anthropology can make a practical contribution through its predictive power in the realm of politics, social attitudes, and group psychology. Andrea L. Smith's new introduction provides convincing evidence for the continuing importance of one of the earliest "public intellectuals."

Clyde Kluckhohn was Professor of Anthropology at Harvard University, best known for his long-term ethnographic work among the Navajo and his contributions to the development of theory of culture within American anthropology.

Andrea L. Smith is Professor of Anthropology and Head of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at Lafayette College, USA.

Routledge Classic Texts in Anthropology

1. Cultural Intimacy

Social Poetics and the Real of Life of States, Societies and Institutions

Michael Herzfeld

2. Evolution and Social Life

Tim Ingold

3. The Reinvention of Primitive Society

Adam Kuper

4. Mimesis and Alterity

Michael Taussig

5. In Search of the Primitive

Stanley Diamond

6. Mirror for Man

The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life

Clyde Kluckhohn

MIRROR FOR MAN

The Relation of Anthropology
to Modern Life

Clyde Kluckhohn

With a new introduction by Andrea L. Smith

First Published in 1949
by McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Published in 2018
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 Taylor & Francis

The right of Clyde Kluckhohn to be identified as author of this work, and Andrea L. Smith of the new Introduction, has been asserted by them in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-08804-7 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-4128-6535-7 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-10712-7 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

To H. G. Rockwood and R. J. Koehler



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Anthropology is often considered a collection of curious facts, telling about the peculiar appearance of exotic people and describing their strange customs and beliefs. It is looked upon as an entertaining diversion, apparently without any bearing upon the conduct of life of civilized communities.

This opinion is mistaken. More than that, I hope to demonstrate that a clear understanding of the principles of anthropology illuminates the social processes of our own times and may show us, if we are ready to listen to its teachings, what to do and what to avoid.

—*Franz Boas (1928)*¹

¹ Reprinted from *Anthropology and Modern Life*, by Franz Boas, by permission of W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. Copyright 1928 by the publishers.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>xiii</i>
A Mirror for Engaged Anthropology? Introduction to Kluckhohn's <i>Mirror for Man</i>	1
1 Queer Customs, Potsherds, and Skulls	13
2 Queer Customs	22
3 Potsherds	38
4 Skulls	58
5 Race: A Modern Myth	72
6 The Gift of Tongues	97
7 Anthropologists at Work	111
8 Personality in Culture	128
9 An Anthropologist Looks at the United States	147

xii Contents

10 An Anthropologist Looks at the World 167

Appendix 184

Acknowledgments 191

Index 196

PREFACE

THIS BOOK is intended for the layman, not for the carping professional. The latter is humbly begged to remember that if I had put in all the documentation he could wish, this book would have grown into several volumes. Had I entered all the qualifications and reservations required in a technical study, the intelligent layman would stop before the end of the first chapter.

There is no claim that every statement is "proved." Anthropology is a young subject, and there is still much work to be done, both gathering and sifting of data. This is an honest and a careful assessment of the evidence I have been able to cover. In certain instances others have, with equal honesty and perhaps with better judgment, drawn different conclusions from the same materials. But I have tried ordinarily to follow the present consensus of the profession. Where I have expressed heterodox or personal opinions, the phrasing gives some warning to the reader. Similarly, by the use of such words as, "some authorities say," "perhaps," "probably," and "maybe," I have indicated my tentative choice between controversial findings or interpretations. For all save a few statements and my own gazings into the crystal ball of the future there is some evidence that I consider hard. Speculations of others or of my own are labeled or are clear as such from context.

Clyde Kluckhohn



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

A MIRROR FOR ENGAGED ANTHROPOLOGY?

Introduction to Kluckhohn's *Mirror for Man*

Andrea L. Smith

In 1949, references to *Mirror for Man* appeared in newspapers across the United States. It was featured in book reviews in *The Cincinnati Enquirer* in January (“Scientist Addresses Himself Particularly To The Layman”), in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* that March, and in May it appeared in the series, “Let’s Explore Your Mind” in *The Akron Beacon Journal*.¹ Its purchase by local libraries was the subject of cheery announcements.² Its author, Clyde Kluckhohn, also traveled far and wide, participating in a radio show in Rochester, Minnesota (on the topic “How Can We Find Personal Peace and Security in Today’s World” alongside two psychiatrists and a clergyman), and giving the commencement address at the University of New Mexico.³ Irvin Dagen of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* described the book as providing “a lucid outline of the background, materials, and methods of anthropology” and wrote that the possibilities of this new field are “here made so intriguing that many new students will be attracted to its study.”⁴ Assistant professor of sociology Edward Pohlman stated in *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, “the aim of the book, or certainly its achievement, is to justify anthropology and anthropologists’ status by showing how the study of man . . . provides a basis for insight into the complexities of modern human relations.”⁵ He described the last two chapters as “courageous,” for they offer

1 Edward Pohlman, “Scientist Addresses Himself Particularly to the Layman,” *The Cincinnati Enquirer* (January 29, 1949), 7; Irvin Dagen, “Proper Study of Mankind,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (March 10, 1949), 22; Albert E. Wiggam, “Let’s Explore Your Mind,” *The Akron Beacon Journal* (May 12, 1949), 52.

2 Mabel Doty, “Interesting Variety of New Books Now Available on La Grande Library Shelves,” *La Grande Observer* (La Grande, OR, March 4, 1949), 3; “New Books,” *The Evening Sun* (Hanover, PA, May 26, 1949), 4; “Variety of New Best Sellers Fills Library,” *The Daily Plainsman* (Huron, SD, March 19, 1950), 5.

3 “‘Personal Peace’ to be Topic on Town Meeting,” *The Winona Republican* (April 25, 1949), 4; “Dr. Kluckhohn to Give U. Commencement Talk,” *Albuquerque Journal* (May 22, 1949), 15.

4 Dagen, “Proper Study,” 22.

5 Pohlman, “Scientist Addresses,” 7.

2 A Mirror for Engaged Anthropology?

insights into the “problems of our day” in both the United States and the world at large.⁶

That Kluckhohn’s text was the focus of such attention may give anthropologists real pause, particularly those involved in the “public anthropology” movement. Since the 1960s, the discipline has been wracked by periodic crises—the colonial critique, crises of representation, and tensions between the discipline’s humanistic and scientific dimensions—and divided by increasing specializations. Additionally, concerns about anthropological relevance have surfaced with some regularity. In her distinguished lecture to the American Anthropological Association in 2000, Laura Nader noted that American anthropology is sometimes “described as self-absorbed, trapped in a diminished reality, inaccessible to the general public.”⁷ A solution to this problem for some is “public anthropology,” that is, anthropology practiced “with a view toward directly and indirectly contributing to the public good—not just to the academic or career good.”⁸ This trend has grown to such a point that in 2010, the discipline’s flagship journal, *American Anthropologist*, began publishing a new section: “Public Anthropology Reviews.” The editors of this new section explain that “many are urging anthropologists to stop complaining about their lack of public relevance and make themselves relevant.”⁹

Mirror for Man, written with the wider public in mind, reminds us that activities now termed “public anthropology” existed long before the phrase was coined.¹⁰ While Franz Boas and his students Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict are the twentieth-century anthropologists most commonly cited for their popular outreach, the book reprinted here represents one of the most successful later efforts. Published in 1949 by McGraw-Hill, it was written by a prominent anthropologist at the height of his career. As anthropologists are again seeking ways to connect with a wider public, it is worth returning to this early example to better understand its implications, influence, and appeal.

“Creative Eclectic”

By all accounts, Clyde May Maben Kluckhohn was a remarkable man. He was known for his long-standing ethnographic fieldwork among Navajo in New Mexico and Arizona, but also for his wide-ranging intellect that led to multiple interdisciplinary

6 Ibid.

7 Laura Nader, “Anthropology! Distinguished Lecture—2000,” *American Anthropologist* 103 (2001): 609–20, 609.

8 Trevor W. Purcell, “Public Anthropology: An Idea Searching for a Reality,” *Transforming Anthropology* 9 (2000): 30–33, 30.

9 Melissa Checker, David Vine and Alaka Wali, “A Sea Change in Anthropology? Public Anthropology Reviews,” *American Anthropologist* 112 (2010): 5–6, 5.

10 Purcell, “Public Anthropology,” 30. Purcell reminds us that anthropology is rooted in nineteenth century European sociology, a “science whose motivation and *raison d’être* was the solution of social ills thrown up by the emergence of industrial capitalism;” for generations, many anthropologists and sociologists “saw no contradiction between the quest for theoretical understanding and the solution of social ills.” Ibid., 32.

collaborations. He was classically trained and a gifted linguist, mastering Greek, Latin, German, French, Spanish, and Navajo, while also versed in psychology and a student of psychoanalysis.

Kluckhohn was born in Iowa in 1905, where he spent his youth. His mother, Katherine Kluckhohn, died soon after his birth, and he was sent to live with his maternal uncle at the age of three when his father remarried. He started college at Princeton but had to withdraw following an episode of rheumatic fever, and he was sent to recuperate with family friends on a ranch in Ramah, New Mexico. This move led him quite accidentally to anthropology, for he spent extended time with his nearest (Navajo) neighbors, people among whom he would later return to conduct fieldwork.¹¹

Kluckhohn returned to college at the University of Wisconsin, completing his degree in 1928 in Greek. He graduated Phi Beta Kappa and served as class president and editor of the school newspaper. Two popular books that he published on his journeys with Navajo (*To the Foot of the Rainbow* (1927) and *Beyond the Rainbow* (1933)) paid the way for trips to Europe where he learned French, Spanish, and German. He studied Greek and Latin at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, and began anthropology at the University of Vienna (1931–2) while undergoing psychoanalysis there with a protégé of Freud. He enrolled at Harvard, completing his Ph.D. there in 1936, where he was hired and spent the rest of his career. This career advanced rapidly: he became associate in 1940 and professor in 1946; he chaired the Department of Anthropology from 1957–60, curated the Peabody Museum's Southwestern Ethnology collections, and was a driving force behind the interdisciplinary Department and Laboratory of Social Relations. During World War II, he moved to Washington, DC, where he worked in the War Department and the Office of War Information, a subject of increasing scrutiny in recent years.¹² He discusses this work in the context of the newly emerging field of applied anthropology in the fascinating chapter "Anthropologists at Work." He was shifting from heavy administrative responsibilities to a new round of publishing when he died of a heart attack in 1960 at age 55 at the start of a sabbatical year in New Mexico.¹³

In their obituary published in the *American Anthropologist*, Talcott Parsons and Evon Z. Vogt emphasize Kluckhohn's "creative eclecticism."¹⁴ They note that his

11 For biographical information, see the following: Melville J. Herskovits, *Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn, 1905–1960. A Biographical Memoir* (Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, 1964); Talcott Parsons, "Clyde Kluckhohn, Anthropologist," *Science* 133 (May 19, 1961): 1584; Talcott Parsons and Evon Z. Vogt, "Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn, 1905–1960," *American Anthropologist* 64 (1962): 140–61.

12 David Price has reviewed Kluckhohn's applied work during the war and after. See David H. Price, *Anthropological Intelligence. The Deployment and Neglect of American Anthropology in the Second World War* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008); *Cold War Anthropology* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016).

13 John L. Fischer and Evon Z. Vogt, "Introduction," *Culture and Life. Essays in Memory of Clyde Kluckhohn*, eds. Walter W. Taylor, John L. Fisher and Evon Z. Vogt (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), 1–13.

14 Parsons and Vogt, "Clyde," 148.

4 A Mirror for Engaged Anthropology?

wide range of interests and publications make it difficult to characterize his theoretical position: he was “deeply interested in developing anthropology as a science; yet he was also a humanist.”¹⁵ They even suggest that his eclecticism may have precluded his founding a specific school or tightly delimited branch of anthropology, although one wonders if such a tack would have felt too limiting to him. He is often considered one of the last great generalists: he first taught physical anthropology and directed archaeological projects in New Mexico;¹⁶ he studied linguistics with Edward Sapir at Yale, became closely involved with the “culture and personality” school, was well known for his theoretical publications on the culture concept, and later in life was turning to a comparative study of values.

Kluckhohn’s commitment to communicating anthropological findings more broadly is illustrated throughout his career, starting with his work in the classroom. He was dedicated to both undergraduate and graduate students, and his rich set of examples and useful analogies found throughout *Mirror for Man* suggest that his courses would have been captivating indeed. Vogt and Parsons attribute his ability to cultivate and encourage novel ideas in his students to his theoretical eclecticism, adding: “he had an astonishing capacity to stimulate students in all branches of anthropology to go ahead on their own, and he was amazingly tolerant of the diversity of points of view that were developed among his students and younger colleagues.”¹⁷ They also recount the “countless hours” he spent listening to the students that flocked to his office at Harvard.

Kluckhohn also had an administrative gift. Described as a “man of the most balanced and penetrating judgment,”¹⁸ he was in demand “as a consultant and advisor outside the University.”¹⁹ His service within and beyond the academy was exceptional: he was president of the American Anthropological Association in 1947, became member of the National Academy of Sciences in 1952, chaired the Division of Anthropology and Psychology of the National Research Council (1956–58), directed Harvard’s Russian Research Center for its first five years, and regularly assisted as consultant for governmental and international organizations.²⁰

Despite these commitments, a persistent focus for Kluckhohn throughout his career was his Navajo research. Kluckhohn conducted the bulk of his fieldwork among Navajo in Ramah, New Mexico, and the resulting publications quickly became classics. He has been described as a “magnificent ethnographer of Navajo life and an interpreter of that life to various American publics.”²¹ Behind the scenes,

15 *Ibid.*, 142.

16 John S. Gilkeson, “Clyde Kluckhohn and the New Anthropology: From Culture and Personality to the Scientific Study of Values,” *Pacific Studies* 32 (June/September, 2009): 251–72, 253.

17 Parsons and Vogt, “Clyde,” 143.

18 Parsons, “Clyde,” 1584.

19 Parsons and Vogt, “Clyde,” 147.

20 Herskovits, *Clyde*, 137; Parsons and Vogt, “Clyde,” 147.

21 David F. Aberle, “Clyde Kluckhohn’s Contributions to Navajo Studies,” *Culture and Life. Essays in Memory of Clyde Kluckhohn*, eds. Walter W. Taylor, John L. Fisher and Evon Z. Vogt (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), 83–93, 88.

he was also an activist on their behalf. In a review of his Navajo research, his former student David Aberle emphasizes “his humane concern with the problems facing the Navajo,” a concern that appears in his scholarly publications, in his writings for the public, and “what he hoped were enlightened administrators or administrators capable of enlightenment.”²² As Talcott Parsons explains, “he was not only a student of his beloved Navajo, but was also one of their most powerful friends in their complicated relations with the federal government, a cause to which he devoted untold exertions.”²³ He intervened regularly on behalf of Navajo and sometimes American Indians more generally: he was consultant to the Office of Indian Affairs; fought against the Public Law 280 of the 83rd Congress, which would have threatened federal legal protections of Native Americans; and participated in Navajo land claims against the U.S. government, serving as expert witness in one case just a few months before his death.²⁴

Kluckhohn’s *Mirror*

Written at the end of World War II with a decidedly non-specialist audience in mind, the manuscript that became *Mirror for Man* won a \$10,000 science-writing prize in 1947 (out of 250 entries).²⁵ It offers a thorough and thoughtful introduction to anthropology rich in illustrations of research findings with lucid prose that is carried forward by a sense of urgency and optimism. It provides an entertaining consideration of anthropology in the immediate post-war era notable for a rich interweaving of what are today distinct subdisciplines. The language is dated, certainly, but the author’s agenda never wavers: to demonstrate how anthropology provides a means of dealing with what he describes as “the crucial dilemma of the world today”: “how can peoples of different appearance, mutually unintelligible languages, and dissimilar ways of life get along peaceably together?”²⁶

The book’s first chapter, “Queer Customs, Potsherds, and Skulls,” has a trick title, for the “queer customs” are those of the anthropologist. The author offers a sometimes-comical view of the anthropological endeavor. Early anthropologists are scholars who “devoted themselves to oddities, to matters which appeared to be so trivial or so specialized that the fields of study which had been established earlier failed to bother with them.”²⁷ This portrayal no doubt served to intrigue and amuse readers, encouraging them to carry on with such a lengthy text.

22 Ibid.

23 Parsons, “Clyde,” 1584.

24 John Adair, “Clyde Kluckhohn and Indian Administration,” *Culture and Life: Essays in Memory of Clyde Kluckhohn*, eds. Walter W. Taylor, John L. Fisher and Evon Z. Vogt (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), 71–82.

25 “\$10,000 Book Award Won by Harvard Man,” *New York Times* (March 14, 1947), 11.

26 Clyde Kluckhohn, *Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949), 1.

27 Ibid., 3.

6 A Mirror for Engaged Anthropology?

The second chapter introduces the idea of culture and offers ample illustrations from societies around the world, including those closer at hand, bringing home the idea that the concept applies to *all* people, not simply “exotic ways of life.” As he writes, even “social workers in Boston will talk about the culture of a colorful and well-knit immigrant group but boggle at applying it to the behavior of staff members in the social-service agency itself.”²⁸ His many examples bring readers to conclude for themselves the wisdom in cultural relativity, and offers a gentle form of “anthropology as culture critique”;²⁹ by presenting examples from around the world, U.S. practices are seen within a much wider frame. Toward the end of this chapter, having pinned down the culture concept, he returns to his wider point, asking, “What good is the concept so far as the contemporary world is concerned? What can you do with it?” He explains that the rest of this book will endeavor to answer these questions.³⁰

The next chapters cover findings from anthropology’s subfields (archaeology, physical anthropology, linguistic and cultural anthropology) in presentations rich in inter-subfield conversations. In “Potsherds,” he demonstrates the ways archaeological findings can require collaborations with historical linguists and ethnographers. His concern with war is evident in this chapter: he discusses Freud and Einstein’s exchange regarding the inevitability of war, and suggests that anthropological insights, which provide a “more scientific approach,” may provide a definitive answer to this troublesome question.³¹

His review of recent findings from physical anthropology about human variability allows him to develop concepts and offer data that will help him dismantle what is of obvious significant concern to him, the “myth of race,” the focus of Chapter 5. This chapter is remarkably measured while reading today as quite modern. He asks where the “race” idea came from and when, framing its origins within the history of biological science, and he provides strong words against miscegenation-phobia (“nowhere in the ‘race’ field is mythology more blatant or more absurd than in the beliefs and practices relating to ‘miscegenation’”).³² He concludes the chapter with a series of steps “we” can do to tackle bigotry—the “we” presumably encompassing all Americans.³³ The reader is reminded of Franz Boas’ similar intervention in response to National Socialist race science, and many of Kluckhohn’s arguments about the race concept can be found on the American Anthropological Association website today.³⁴

28 *Ibid.*, 29.

29 George E. Marcus and Michael M. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique. An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

30 Kluckhohn, *Mirror*, 37.

31 *Ibid.*, 54.

32 *Ibid.*, 129.

33 *Ibid.*, 140–44.

34 Franz Boas, *Race, Language, and Culture* (New York: MacMillan, 1940); *Race and Democratic Society* (New York: J. J. Augustin, 1945); the American Anthropological Association has created its own web-based statement on race: www.understandingrace.org/home.html.

Why would a scholar at the height of his career spend a year writing this book? Its timing, a few years after World War II, is already revealing, and his concerns are further laid bare in his concluding chapter, “An Anthropologist Looks at the World.” It becomes clear that what is at stake for him is nothing short of the annihilation of humanity through nuclear war. Anthropology, he argues, has a strategic position for “determining what factors will create a world community of distinct cultures and hold it together against disruption.”³⁵ Why anthropology? He continues:

As a consequence of their cross-cultural research anthropologists are freer to disbelieve something that appears, even to their fellow scientists of the same culture, necessarily true.³⁶

Open-mindedness was a trait greatly needed, in his view: “In the present stage of world history the apparently unbridgeable gap between several powerful and competing ways of life can be surmounted only by those who can constructively doubt the traditionally obvious.”³⁷ Kluckhohn would spend the next decade of his life trying to help bridge this gap in ways that would eventually raise questions in some circles.

Cold Warrior? Applied Anthropology in Wartime and Beyond

The reprinting of this book is timely not only as an example of public anthropology but also due to the insights it provides into Kluckhohn’s work as an applied anthropologist during World War II and beyond. The phrase “applied anthropology” was first used in 1941 with the creation of the Society for Applied Anthropology, which unites anthropologists committed to the “application of the principles, theories, methods and approaches of anthropology to the interdisciplinary identification and solution of human problems.”³⁸ Applied anthropology skyrocketed during World War II, when an estimated three-quarters of all American anthropologists worked in some way for the war effort; by mid-1943, “virtually every wartime agency had an anthropologist or two on staff.”³⁹ Anthropologists took on many different roles during the war: they offered advice at every level of the government, were brought in for the specialized language skills, and spent time devising plans to encourage soldiers—and countries—to surrender; others worked outright as spies, using ethnographic or archaeological fieldwork as a cover. Implications of this form of applied anthropology have received new interest in the discipline recently.⁴⁰ Kluckhohn

35 Kluckhohn, *Mirror*, 286.

36 *Ibid.*

37 *Ibid.*, 287.

38 From website of the Society for Applied Anthropology, www.sfaa.net/about/governance/mission/.

39 See Price, *Anthropological Intelligence*, 37.

40 David Price has led this effort with a rich series of articles in academic and popular presses on the ethical issues as well as the longer-lasting consequences to the discipline of having so much research directly or indirectly guided by military agendas; these insights appear in his trilogy of books

worked for a variety of agencies, including the War Department and the Office of War Information, and he discusses some of the goals and frustrations in the chapter “Anthropologists at Work.”

Long after World War II, Margaret Mead wrote that a general consensus had emerged among the wartime applied anthropologists that much of what they advised “had simply fallen on deaf ears.”⁴¹ In his review of these efforts, David Price advises against further participation of this kind, writing, “as anthropologists find themselves in recurrent advisory roles in which their advice is ignored or unwelcome, questions are raised about the wisdom of continuing to take on such roles.”⁴² Despite wartime frustrations, anthropologists like Mead, Benedict, and Kluckhohn continued to consult for various branches of the military at the war’s end, and today one might wonder why. Kluckhohn was asked to help run Harvard’s new Russian Research Center, a position he only reluctantly accepted,⁴³ and he consulted for General MacArthur’s headquarters in Tokyo (1946), and after 1947, for the Department of the Air Force, Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Research and Development Board of the Department of the Army.⁴⁴ Because of these entanglements, and especially his Russian Research Center activities, David Price has labeled him an “anthropologist cold warrior,” but the verdict is still out.⁴⁵ George Stocking has argued that during his era (1950s), “both he and the issues he faced were too complex.”⁴⁶

While we cannot resolve this debate here, *Mirror for Man* provides a window into Kluckhohn’s motivations. In it he provides ardent justification for what became for him a mixture of applied and public anthropology. He proclaims, “The anthropologist

published by Duke, including *Anthropological Intelligence* (2008), *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI’s Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004) and *Cold War Anthropology* (2016). See also Sigmund Diamond, *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities With the Intelligence Community, 1945–1955* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) and David Engerman, “Social Science in the Cold War,” *Isis* 101 (June 2010): 393–400, 399.

41 Margaret Mead, “Anthropological Contributions to National Policies during and Immediately after World War II,” *The Uses of Anthropology*, ed. Walter Goldschmidt (Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1979), 153 cited in in Price, *Anthropological Intelligence*, 198.

42 Price, *Anthropological Intelligence*, 270.

43 Herskovits, p. 137.

44 Herskovits, p. 137.

45 On the Russian Research Center, see Price, *Cold War*. See also Diamond, *Compromised Campus*. Diamond suggests that Kluckhohn was coerced into serving as first director of the Russian Center by the FBI due to some transgression. See Diamond, *Compromised*, 296, n9. David Engerman, on the other hand, notes that Kluckhohn’s one publication based on the Russian Research Center studies “amounted to a refutation of the Air Force view of the Soviet Union. In publications as well as in classified reports, Kluckhohn and his team insisted that the Soviet regime had wide if not deep support from its citizens, and was not teetering on the brink of collapse” (Engerman, “Social Science in the Cold War,” 393–400, 399).

46 See Price, *Cold War Anthropology*, 84; George W. Stocking, Jr., “‘Do Good, Young Man’: Sol Tax and the World Mission of Liberal Democratic Anthropology,” *Excluded Ancestors, Inevitable Traditions. Essays Toward a More Inclusive History of Anthropology*, ed. Richard Handler (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000): 171–264, 253.

as citizen is morally obligated to look at the world.”⁴⁷ He promotes applied anthropology as one way to do so, in part due to its public education potential:

Applied anthropology . . . has the function of instructing the general public as well as that of advising the administrator. Ignorance of the way of life in other countries breeds an indifference and callousness among nations, a misinterpretation and misunderstanding which becomes ever more threatening as the world shrinks.⁴⁸

Reading between the lines in *Mirror for Man*, the reader also gains a sense that Kluckhohn spent much time trying to interpret the foreign culture of the military and other administrators for whom he was working (“The practical anthropologist must also have a systematic understanding of the *special subcultures* of the policy makers, the supervisory administrators, and the field operators”⁴⁹). He notes the “cultural stereotypes” held by “the majority of American policy makers”⁵⁰ he confronted during his wartime work and writes that anthropologists during the war “had the general objection that the solution to conflicts between the United States and other peoples can never rest on a cultural imperialism that insists upon the substitution of our institutions for theirs.”⁵¹ One wonders if it was not in fact these wartime encounters with policymakers and members of the military that encouraged him to accept such arduous positions as the Russia program directorship to begin with. That policymakers do *not* typically attempt the sort of self-analysis he would recommend was obvious to him, and a trait he found quite dangerous: he even suggests that Pearl Harbor might not have happened had European countries not been so “shortsighted” and culturally blind in their early dealings with Japan.⁵²

It was only in the mid-1960s that anthropology began a serious reckoning of the ethical implications of “dual use” anthropology serving a military agenda,⁵³ and much later still that a thorough accounting of anthropology during the entire Cold War period and its implications for today had begun. *Mirror for Man* helps correct presentist interpretations of this work as it returns us to the optimism of the immediate post-war years. It suggests, moreover, that Kluckhohn embarked on his applied anthropology forays due to his strong belief that the wisdom of anthropological science was needed and would be convincing, indeed, *had* to be convincing in order to shift the world from the brink of nuclear apocalypse.

47 Kluckhohn, *Mirror*, 264.

48 *Ibid.*, 172.

49 *Ibid.*, 185.

50 *Ibid.*, 178.

51 *Ibid.*, 175.

52 *Ibid.*, 189.

53 For “dual use” phrase, see Price, *Cold War*, xiv; Price, *Cold War*, 350; Stocking, “Do Good,” 254.

Kluckhohn's abrupt ending of all administrative functions, including the directorship of the Harvard Russian Center, and his retreat to New Mexico to return to scholarly writing leaves us with many questions. Was this a reaction to the heavy cost of his applied anthropology commitments? How would he have reflected later on his efforts to influence U.S. interactions with the Soviet Union? Finally, where would he have stood following the colonial critique and later critiques of anthropological entanglements with espionage? Unfortunately, due to his untimely death, we will never know, and anthropology lost a committed scholar whose further reflections on his and others' applied engagement with policymakers at the highest levels would have been fascinating indeed.

A Mirror for Public Anthropology

Ironically, the success of works like *Mirror for Man* may have led to the sharp decline in public anthropology in the decades following the war. The discipline experienced an unprecedented increase in funding, teaching, and other research possibilities, which allowed anthropologists to "retreat into an academic world in which the relationship of anthropologists and society at large was mediated by the research grant and the interdisciplinary conference."⁵⁴

Where does public anthropology stand today? The individual most commonly associated with the renewed interest in public anthropology is Robert Borofsky, who founded the Center for a Public Anthropology during the first decade of the new millennium.⁵⁵ The Center's main projects include an anthropology journal archive, a community action website project for undergraduates, an assessment measure of public outreach at doctoral programs, and the California Series in Public Anthropology. This book series, published by the University of California Press, was designed to encourage "anthropologists to address major issues of our time . . . in ways that help non-academic audiences to understand and address them."⁵⁶ Borofsky has admitted that this series hasn't achieved its aims; a few books have sold "as many as 70,000 copies, while most are selling between 1,500–3,000 copies," and most "go to classrooms."⁵⁷ The book competition was even opened to non-anthropologists in 2011. In his review of the Center's activities, David Vine writes that this is possibly a "sad statement on anthropologists' current ability to write about important public issues for broad public audiences."⁵⁸ He also suggests that another source of the problem may be "the contradiction of publishing works

54 George Stocking, "Introduction: Thoughts Toward a History of the Interwar Years," *American Anthropology, 1921–1945* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1976), 53.

55 On the Center's website, Borofsky explains he started the center in 2001–4. See www.publicanthropology.org/about/.

56 Center for a Public Anthropology, "The Book Series Overview," in David Vine, "'Public Anthropology' in its Second Decade: Robert Borofsky's Center for a Public Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 113 (2011): 336–49, 337.

57 Vine, "'Public Anthropology' in its Second Decade," 338.

58 *Ibid.*

of public anthropology with an academic press,” adding, “given the structural limitations of academic presses, perhaps it’s also time for more anthropologists to focus on earning book contracts from high-quality commercial publishers, cross-over houses, and alternative presses that have greater capacity to disseminate books and ideas to the broadest audiences.”⁵⁹

In a previous era, some anthropologists did just that, carrying out multiple publishing tracks simultaneously. Kluckhohn was a master at this kind of multi-tasking: the manuscript that became *Mirror for Man* received its prize a few months after his scholarly work *Children of the People* appeared (1947, co-authored with psychologist Dorothea Leighton), a book that was described in 1973 as “the best-rounded ethnography of the Navajo for any period now available.”⁶⁰ In 1949, he also received a large multi-year grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for a multi-sited ethnographic study of values in the southwestern United States that involved thirty-seven researchers and furthered the careers of dozens of students.⁶¹ Kluckhohn’s commitment to advancing scholarship while bringing anthropological insights to bear on wider policy discussions is evident in his parallel lifetime of behind-the-scenes work with the federal government on behalf of the Navajo, and in his engagement with popular media. While his wartime activities still require further accounting, the statements found in the relevant chapters of this book suggest that it was difficult work indeed. That he was able to step back and write about it clearly has left us with both a sense of the commitment to humanity and optimism that drove his involvement, as well as his frustrations. Kluckhohn found a way to write for multiple audiences, fearlessly engaging in different kinds of enterprise and carrying out multiple lives, as it were, simultaneously.

How might we assess the overall influence of *Mirror for Man*? When it appeared in its paperback (ninth) edition in 1958, it was the focus of book clubs (in Rushville, Indiana) and in op-ed pieces against racial segregation.⁶² In the 1990s, it was featured in high school essay exams in Los Angeles.⁶³ It clearly brought anthropology to a much wider stage; indeed, some associate the optimism embodied by this book with anthropology’s ascension to its status as the “reigning social science” in the immediate post-war years.⁶⁴ Perhaps its most lasting influence on the discipline was in its attraction of students to the field to begin with. In her lecture to the American Anthropological Association, Laura Nader remembers reading *Mirror for Man* “before knowing such a discipline existed.” She recalls that she “went to study at Harvard because Kluckhohn envisioned a big anthropology, a wide-angled inclusive discipline intolerant of boundaries in the pursuit of knowledge,” and she

59 Ibid.

60 Aberle, “Contributions,” 89.

61 Fischer and Vogt, “Introduction,” 4.

62 “Komentri Club,” *Rushville Republican* (Rushville, IN; May 13, 1959); Russell Eisenman, “Segregation,” *The Daily Tar Heel* (Chapel Hill, NC; December 3, 1858), 2.

63 “The Subject A Examination,” *The Los Angeles Times* (June 3, 1998), 102.

64 Gilkeson, “Kluckhohn and the New Anthropology,” 252.

12 A Mirror for Engaged Anthropology?

describes the graduate program he directed as a place of “disciplinary optimism.”⁶⁵ But the greatest influence of this book may have been with those readers never able to pursue a career in anthropology, Kluckhohn’s intended audience—an influence difficult to assess at present. However we measure its long-term influence, *Mirror for Man* is worth considering as it offers an effective mirror today for scholars committed to either applied or “public” anthropology.

65 Nader, “Anthropology!,” 611.